



## GREG MATHIS CHARTER

2872 Azalea Drive

N. Charleston, SC 29405

<b>Grades</b>	8-12 High School	
<b>Enrollment</b>	92 Students	
<b>Principal</b>	Kenneth Sellers	843-557-1611
<b>Superintendent</b>	Dr. Nancy J. McGinley	843-937-6319
<b>Board Chair</b>	Mrs. Ruth Jordan	843-345-4529

# THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA 2010 ANNUAL SCHOOL REPORT CARD

## RATINGS OVER 5-YEAR PERIOD

YEAR	ABSOLUTE RATING	GROWTH RATING
<b>2010</b>	<b>At-Risk</b>	<b>Below Average</b>
2009	At-Risk	Below Average
2008	At-Risk	Below Average
2007	At-Risk	N/A
2006	N/A	N/A

## DEFINITIONS OF SCHOOL RATING TERMS

- Excellent – School performance substantially exceeds the standards for progress toward the 2020 SC Performance Vision
- Good – School performance exceeds the standards for progress toward the 2020 SC Performance Vision
- Average – School performance meets the standards for progress toward the 2020 SC Performance Vision
- Below Average – School is in jeopardy of not meeting the standards for progress toward the 2020 SC Performance Vision
- At-Risk – School performance fails to meet the standards for progress toward the 2020 SC Performance Vision

## SOUTH CAROLINA PERFORMANCE GOAL

By 2010, SC's student achievement will be ranked in the top half of the states nationally. To achieve this goal, we must become one of the fastest improving systems in the country.

## SOUTH CAROLINA PERFORMANCE VISION

By 2020 all students will graduate with the knowledge and skills necessary to compete successfully in the global economy, participate in a democratic society and contribute positively as members of families and communities.

ABSOLUTE RATINGS OF HIGH SCHOOLS WITH STUDENTS LIKE OURS\*

Excellent	Good	Average	Below Average	At-Risk
0	2	10	5	13

\* Ratings are calculated with data available by 03/24/2011.

High School Assessment Program (HSAP) Exam Passage Rate: Second Year Students

	Our High School			High Schools with Students Like Ours		
Percent	2008	2009	2010	2008	2009	2010
Passed 2 subtests (%)	20.0%	6.3%	11.1%	60.7%	58.0%	57.5%
Passed 1 subtest (%)	20.0%	25.0%	66.7%	16.3%	20.6%	19.3%
Passed no subtests (%)	60.0%	68.8%	22.2%	23.8%	24.5%	26.7%

HSAP Passage Rate by Spring 2010

	Our High School	High Schools with Students Like Ours
Percent	42.1%	80.3%

Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rate

	Our High School		High Schools with Students Like Ours	
	2009*	2010	2009*	2010
Number of Students in Four-Year Cohort	58	109	94	114
Number of Graduates in Cohort	1	3	60	72
Rate	1.7%	2.8%	56.4%	57.2%

\*Used to calculate current AYP.

End of Course Tests

Percent of tests with scores of 70 or above on:	Our High School	High Schools with Students Like Ours*
Algebra 1/Math for the Technologies 2	8.3%	52.2%
English 1	30.8%	47.2%
Physical Science	3.8%	33.0%
US History and the Constitution	0.0%	23.7%
All Tests	10.8%	37.9%

\* High Schools with Poverty Indices of no more than 5% above or below the index for this school.

Abbreviations for Missing Data

N/A–Not Applicable   N/AV–Not Available   N/C–Not Collected   N/R–Not Reported   I/S–Insufficient Sample

School Profile

	Our School	Change from Last Year	High Schools with Students Like Ours	Median High School
<b>Students (n=92)</b>				
Retention rate	16.2%	Down from 30.4%	5.9%	3.7%
Attendance rate	81.4%	Up from 73.8%	94.8%	95.4%
Eligible for gifted and talented	0.0%	No Change	2.7%	12.4%
With disabilities other than speech	4.2%	Up from 1.4%	15.1%	12.8%
Older than usual for grade	73.9%	Up from 68.2%	14.7%	9.1%
Out-of-school suspensions or expulsions for violent and/or criminal offenses	2.2%	Down from 11.8%	2.2%	1.1%
Enrolled in AP/IB programs	0.0%	No Change	4.1%	13.1%
Successful on AP/IB exams	N/A	N/A	40.0%	50.4%
Eligible for LIFE Scholarship	0.0%	No Change	25.4%	30.4%
Annual dropout rate	28.6%	Down from 43.5%	2.4%	3.1%
Career/technology students in co-curricular organizations	0.0%	No Change	3.3%	2.2%
Enrollment in career/technology courses	39	Down from 75	186	424
Students participating in work-based experiences	0.0%	No Change	4.9%	11.7%
Career/technology students attaining technical skills	66.7%	Up from 56.8%	76.3%	78.7%
Career/technology completers placed	N/A	N/A	96.4%	98.5%
<b>Teachers (n=9)</b>				
Teachers with advanced degrees	33.3%	Down from 62.5%	55.7%	60.4%
Continuing contract teachers	33.3%	Up from 0.0%	58.7%	76.6%
Teachers with emergency or provisional certificates	33.3%	Up from 16.7%	19.4%	6.5%
Teachers returning from previous year	N/A	N/A	78.0%	86.8%
Teacher attendance rate	89.7%	Down from 100.0%	95.5%	95.8%
Average teacher salary*	\$35,057	Down 1.6%	\$43,397	\$47,390
Professional development days/teacher	5.0 days	No Change	10.3 days	10.0 days
<b>School</b>				
Principal's years at school	2.0	Up from 1.0	3.0	4.0
Student-teacher ratio in core subjects	18.4 to 1	Up from 17.0 to 1	20.0 to 1	25.8 to 1
Prime instructional time	70.5%	Down from 73.8%	89.3%	90.1%
Dollars spent per pupil**	N/A	N/A	\$10,836	\$7,974
Percent of expenditures for teacher salaries**	N/A	N/A	52.2%	55.4%
Percent of expenditures for instruction**	N/A	N/A	58.5%	60.4%
Opportunities in the arts	Poor	No Change	Good	Excellent
SACS accreditation	No	No Change	Yes	Yes
Parents attending conferences	100.0%	Up from 99.0%	97.1%	96.0%
Character development program	Good	No Change	Good	Good
Modern language program assessment	N/A	N/A	Average	Average
Classical language program assessment	N/A	N/A	N/A	Average

\* Includes current year teachers contracted for 185 or more days.

\*\* Prior year audited financial data are reported.

Abbreviations for Missing Data

N/A--Not Applicable N/AV--Not Available N/C--Not Collected N/R--Not Reported I/S--Insufficient Sample

Performance By Student Groups

	HSAP Passage Rate by Spring 2010		End of Course Tests Passage Rate		On-time Graduation Rate, 2010		
	n	%	t	%	n	%	Met AYP Objective
All Students	19	42.1%	93	10.8%	109	2.8%	No
Gender							
Male	12	25.0%	47	10.6%	74	2.7%	N/A
Female	N/A	N/A	46	10.9%	35	2.9%	N/A
Racial/Ethnic Group							
White	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
African American	18	38.9%	93	10.8%	105	2.9%	N/A
Asian/Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
American Indian/Alaskan	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Disability Status							
Disabled	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Migrant Status							
Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
English Proficiency							
Limited English Proficient	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Socio-Economic Status							
Subsidized meals	15	40.0%	68	11.8%	73	4.1%	N/A

NOTE: n=number of students on which percentage is calculated; t=number of tests taken.

Abbreviations for Missing Data

N/A–Not Applicable    N/AV–Not Available    N/C–Not Collected    N/R–Not Reported    I/S–Insufficient Sample

Report of Principal and School Improvement Council

Greg Mathis Charter High School (GMCHS) faced a number of challenges this past school year, but GMCHS is continuing to develop its instructional programs to address our students' learning needs.

GMCHS's mission is to identify students' readiness level, provide research-proven instructional strategies, develop and implement an academic plan that leads students to complete a high school education and enter the workforce as contributing members of society.

GMCHS supports Charleston County School District's Coherent Curriculum and belief that every child can learn. GMCHS is making a difference in the lives of the students that attend regularly. There is a positive correlation between attendance and a student's achievement on assessments. The aim of this educational program is to inspire in each student a lifelong love of learning, increasing his or her attendance and participation, which will result in effective character education and life skills.

GMCHS's challenges included outstanding audits and debt to the Charleston County School District. We are pleased to share with you that the school's audits are current, and the school's debt has been reduced by one-third. We are actively engaged in the processes to improve student achievement, such as retaining highly qualified classroom teachers in the content areas.

The Board of Trustees is actively involved in creating partnerships to benefit our instructional program. The Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) is continuing to grow through parent participation and support. Local business contributed by volunteering, mentoring, and sharing their respective expertise with our students. We shall continue to inspire and challenge our youth to increase student achievement.

Kenneth L. Sellers, Principal  
Maria Jackson, School Improvement Council Chairperson

Evaluations by Teachers, Students and Parents

	Teachers	Students*	Parents*
Number of surveys returned	4	17	12
Percent satisfied with learning environment	I/S	76.5%	91.7%
Percent satisfied with social and physical environment	I/S	68.8%	75.0%
Percent satisfied with school-home relations	I/S	93.8%	100.0%

\* Only eleventh grade students and their parents were included. For schools without grade eleven, only the highest grade was included.

Abbreviations for Missing Data

N/A--Not Applicable    N/AV--Not Available    N/C--Not Collected    N/R--Not Reported    I/S--Insufficient Sample

School Adequate Yearly Progress	NO
---------------------------------	----

This school met 0 out of 5 objectives. The objectives included student performance, graduation rate or student attendance, and participation in the state testing program.

Definition: As required by the United States Department of Education, Adequate Yearly Progress specifies that the statewide target is met for "All Students" and for the following subgroups: Racial/Ethnic, Subsidized Meals, Disability, and Limited English Proficiency in the areas of English/Language Arts and Mathematics, as well as meeting the statewide target for "All Students" for attendance or graduation rate.

School Improvement Status	CSI
---------------------------	-----

School Improvement Key

NI	Newly Identified-The school missed adequate yearly progress (AYP) for two years. Sanction: Offer school choice.
CSI	Continuing School Improvement-The school missed AYP for three years. Sanctions: Continue school choice and implement supplemental services.
CA	Corrective Action-The school missed AYP for four years. Sanction: Continue school choice and supplemental services. The school district takes a corrective action.
RP	Plan to Restructure-Sanctions: Continue school choice and supplemental services. Develop a plan to restructure. If the school misses AYP the next year, the school implements the restructuring plan.
R	Restructure-The school missed AYP after two years of corrective action. Sanctions: Implement the restructuring plan. Continue school choice and supplemental services.
DELAY	The school met AYP in all subgroups and the indicator for one year, thus the delay provision applies. The school remains in the same status as last year and is referred to as in "Delay."
HOLD	The school made progress for one year in the subject area that identified the school for school improvement. The school remains in the same status as last year and is referred to as in "Hold."

Teacher Quality Data

	Our District	State
Classes in low poverty schools not taught by highly qualified teachers	3.8%	1.9%
Classes in high poverty schools not taught by highly qualified teachers	8.6%	5.6%

  

	Our School	State Objective	Met State Objective
Classes not taught by highly qualified teachers	41.0%	0.0%	No

## HSAP Performance By Group

	Enrollment 1st Day of Testing	% Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	School % Proficient or Advanced*	District % Proficient or Advanced*	State % Proficient or Advanced*	Performance Objective Met	Participation Objective Met
English/Language Arts - State Performance Objective = 71.3% (Proficient or Advanced)											
All Students	14	64.3	25	75	0	0	0	69.8	65.9	No	No
Male	8	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	67.3	60.8	N/A	N/A
Female	6	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	72.3	71	N/A	N/A
White	N/A	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	91.6	77.5	I/S	I/S
African American	14	64.3	25	75	0	0	0	48.4	49.7	I/S	I/S
Asian/Pacific Islander	N/A	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	87.2	80.2	I/S	I/S
Hispanic	N/A	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	62.6	56.8	I/S	I/S
American Indian/Alaskan	N/A	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	65.9	I/S	I/S
Disabled	N/A	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	28.3	21.3	I/S	I/S
Migrant	N/A	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	N/A	N/A
Limited English Proficient	N/A	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	54.7	47.3	I/S	I/S
Subsidized meals	9	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	50.2	51.5	I/S	I/S

## Mathematics - State Performance Objective = 70.0% (Proficient or Advanced)

All Students	14	64.3	75	25	0	0	0	64.2	62.3	No	No
Male	8	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	66.5	61.7	N/A	N/A
Female	6	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	62	63	N/A	N/A
White	N/A	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	86.8	75	I/S	I/S
African American	14	64.3	75	25	0	0	0	41.8	44	I/S	I/S
Asian/Pacific Islander	N/A	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	87.2	85.5	I/S	I/S
Hispanic	N/A	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	58.9	56.7	I/S	I/S
American Indian/Alaskan	N/A	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	62.5	I/S	I/S
Disabled	N/A	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	25.7	22.1	I/S	I/S
Migrant	N/A	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	N/A	N/A
Limited English Proficient	N/A	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	59.3	52.6	I/S	I/S
Subsidized meals	9	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	43.1	48.1	I/S	I/S

## Physical Science (End-of-Course Test performance by Group)

All Students	14	71.4	N/AV	N/AV	N/AV	N/AV	N/AV	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Male	8	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Female	6	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
White	N/A	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
African American	14	71.4	N/AV	N/AV	N/AV	N/AV	N/AV	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian/Pacific Islander	N/A	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic	N/A	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
American Indian/Alaskan	N/A	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Disabled	N/A	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Migrant	N/A	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Limited English Proficient	N/A	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Subsidized meals	9	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

\* Adjusted to account for natural variation in performance.

Abbreviations for Missing Data

N/A–Not Applicable N/AV–Not Available N/C–Not Collected N/R–Not Reported I/S–Insufficient Sample

Two-Year HSAP Trend Data										
	School Year	Enrollment 1st Day of Testing	% Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	School % Proficient or Advanced*	District % Proficient or Advanced*	State % Proficient or Advanced*
English/Language Arts - State Performance Objective = 71.3% (Proficient or Advanced)										
All Students	2009	38	81.6	75	25	0	0	0	64.1	61.8
	2010	14	64.3	25	75	0	0	0	69.8	65.9
Mathematics - State Performance Objective = 70.0% (Proficient or Advanced)										
All Students	2009	38	81.6	75	25	0	0	8.3	62.9	62.7
	2010	14	64.3	75	25	0	0	0	64.2	62.3

\* Adjusted to account for natural variation in performance.